



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,258	01/30/2004	Michael E. Caine	CS23015RL	8144
20280	7590	04/20/2007		
MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 ROOM AS437 LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			EXAMINER PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/769,258	CAINE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff Piziali	2629	

All Participants:

(1) Jeff Piziali.

(2) Lawrence J. Chapa (Registration Number 39,135).

Status of Application: Final Rejection

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 April 2007

Time: 11:30 AM (EST)

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102(b)

Claims discussed:

1, 12, 18, and 19

Prior art documents discussed:

Swanson (US 6,541,715 B2)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner initiated a telephone interview with the applicants' representative, Mr. Lawrence J. Chapa (Registration Number 39,135) on 4 April 2007. Mr. Chapa was kind enough to take the examiner's call.

The examiner suggested adding some subject matter (somewhat similar to the triangular shaped key subject matter already found in dependent claim 12) to the independent claim language (i.e., claims 1, 18, and 19), so as to better clarify the structural arrangement and operation of the "secondary input selections" (also occasionally referred to as "secondary characters").

Mr. Chapa cut the examiner off in mid-sentence as the examiner tried to explain the claim language alterations (telling the examiner to "just cut to the chase"), exhibited disinterest in consulting the matter with his client, immediately declined entry of any and all proposed claim language alterations, and expressed a wholesale unwillingness to entertain any claim language changes whatsoever; saying succinctly, "We are entitled to broader claim language."

Sensing a distinct impasse on the road to compromise with Mr. Chapa (who boasted of his confidence in pursuing an appeal before the Board), the examiner agreed to move forward with the applicants' "Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review" (filed 22 March 2007).



Jeff Piziali
4 April 2007